

Sri V. S. PATIL.—May I know whether any time limit for the disposal of these applications has been prescribed by the Government?

Sri MOHAMED ALI.—No time limit can be fixed. It depends upon the availability of funds and the instructions of the Government are that loans should be granted as early as possible.

ಶ್ರೀ ಡಿ. ಐ. ಸೀತಾರಾಮರಾವ್.—ನೂವರಿಂ ಚೆಚೆಂಟೆರದರು ರಕ್ಷಿಸಿದ್ದ ಪಾಡಿರುವಷ್ಟು ಹಣ ಕೊಡದೆ ಇರುವುದರಿಂದ ಈಕ್ಕಾರಿಕೆ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಜನಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಅತ್ಯಪ್ರಿಯುಂಟಾಗಿರುವುದು ನಕಾರದವರ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದಿದೆಯೇ?

Sri MOHAMED ALI.—No such representation has been made to the Government till now.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕುಂದೂರು ರುದ್ರಪ್ಪ.—ಈ ಕ್ಕಾರಿಕೆ ಸಬಂಧದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲಸ ನರಿಯಾಗಿ ನೆಮ್ಮೆತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂಬುದು ನಕಾರದವರ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದಿದೆಯೇ?

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಆಗರೇ ಉತ್ತರ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ಕೇಳಿನಲ್ಲಿದೆಯೇ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಕುಂದೂರು ರುದ್ರಪ್ಪ.—ಕೇಳಿದ್ದರೆ ಪ್ರತ್ಯೇಕಾಕೃತಿದ್ದನೇ! (ಸಫೇದು ನಗು)!

Sri MOHAMED ALI.—Out of 210 applications, only 14 applications are pending. That shows the very good progress of the work of the Department, Sir.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕುಂದೂರು ರುದ್ರಪ್ಪ.—14 ಅಜ್ಞಗಳು ಏರ್ದೆಂದು ಆಗಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೀರೋ. ಮನು ಕಷ್ಟ ಇದೆ, ಏಕೆ ವಿರೇಖಾರಿ ಆಗಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಕೇಳುತ್ತಾ ಇದ್ದೇನೆ.

Sri MOHAMED ALI.—The reasons have been mentioned in the reply itself, Sir.

Anti-Corruption Enquiry against the Director of Public Health.

Q.—1582. **Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA (Gubbi).**—

Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(a) the stage at which the anti-corruption enquiry against the Director of Public Health stands;

(b) the findings of the Enquiry Officer?

A.—**Sri R. M. PATIL** (Minister for Health).—

(a) The enquiry by the Anti-Corruption Office into the misuse of the

drugs by the office of the Director of Public Health has been completed.

(b) The enquiry officer has reported that there was a misuse of drugs to the extent of Rs. 14,000 by distributing medicines and drugs to various officials in the Public Health Department, which drugs and medicines were meant for Health Units in the Public Health Department and that the officers concerned are liable for the amount.

Sri T. SUBRAMANYA.—Sir, before the supplementaries are put on these answers, I would like to bring to your notice that the questions are one and the answers are another. They do not relate to the questions. The question is: “the stage at which the anti-corruption enquiry against the Director of Public Health stands,” the answer is: “the enquiry of the anti-corruption office into the misuse of the drugs of the office of the Director of Public Health, has been completed.” The question is about the Dirctor of Public Health. If there is any anti-corruption enquiry against the Director of Public Health, they should say “Yes” Otherwise, “No” Instead of that, the Government say something else. That is one thing.

The next point is, the Chair was pleased to state day before yesterday that a ruling would be given on the question relating to the allegation on public officers that may be put in this House.

Mr. SPEAKER.—It will be given tomorrow.

Sri T. SUBRAMANYA.—So, this question will be held over till tomorrow!

Mr. SPEAKER.—So far as the first point is concerned, the Hon'ble Minister in charge will give the reply. So far as the second point is concerned, the statement that I promised to give to the House, I will give it tomorrow. But at the same time, it must be observed that this question is not in respect of allegations, but in respect of an enquiry. Before I admitted the question, I made myself sure whether there was any enquiry at all. After I came to know that there was such an enquiry, I admitted the question. It is not one of allegation, but it is about an enquiry about an officer.

Sri K. S. SURYANARAYANA RAO.—Is it not an enquiry in respect of an allegation made?

Mr. SPEAKER.—An allegation made in this House is different from an enquiry made by the Government.

Sri K. S. SURYANARAYANA RAO.—The question is about the allegation made outside the House and the enquiry is conducted outside the House.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—On a point of order, Sir. Is it open to any Hon'ble Member to go on arguing about the admissibility of the question when the Chair has admitted the question?

Mr. SPEAKER.—Admissibility of the question cannot be a matter in issue. That is certain.

Sri T. SUBRAMANYA.—Sir, I do not like Sri Mallaradhy, an Hon'ble Member of this House, to take up that stand. When we find that an answer is not relevant to the question before us, it is within the right of the members to bring to the notice of the Chair the irrelevancy of the answer, unless the Director was also involved in the corruption charge that was enquired into.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—On a word of personal explanation. I am as much zealous as anybody else on the floor of this house to guard the privileges of the members. But my point is in regard to the procedure. In fact the Chair has stated often times before that whenever a question has been admitted, there is no question of argument. In fact, you have denied that privilege to me. Apart from that, on the present occasion, the question is admitted by the Chair and to enter into an argument even when the Chair has given a ruling, is it correct? At that rate, it is very difficult for any Legislative Assembly to carry on its proceedings.

Sri T. SUBRAMANYA.—I never questioned about the admissibility. I only questioned about the relevancy of the answer furnished.

Mr. SPEAKER.—So far as that is concerned, the Hon'ble Minister will give a reply.

Sri N. RACHIAH.—Sir, the Hon'ble Member Sri Mallaradhy, I think is not correct in questioning the rights of members, because Sri Suryanarayana Rao was putting a question to the Chair and the Chair was actually allowing the member to answer. But in between Sri Mallaradhy has intervened and as such, the rights of members would be interfered with by such points of order and as such he is not in order.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Sir, I am astonished at the attitude taken by my Hon'ble friend. I raised a point of order and the Chair has disposed of that point of order. For the Hon'ble Member now to get up and say that it is not in order is something which I cannot take. I do not take any instruction from an Hon'ble Member here, however distinguished he may be. I am afraid, he is going out of the way to make such comments which I resent very emphatically.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Every Hon'ble Member has the same privilege.

So far as the first question is concerned, the Hon'ble Minister will give a reply. As regards, the admissibility of the question, I have already admitted the question and there can be no doubt about the admissibility at all. Regarding the allegations made by some people outside and an enquiry being conducted by the Government, it is a different matter altogether. The information that is asked for here is about that enquiry which was conducted by the Government and which is just completed. So, I am only concerned with the allegations made in this House and not by outsiders outside this House.

Sri R. M. PATIL.—The enquiry was as regards the conduct of the Director of Public Health, in respect of his office while using the medicine. Thereby all the officers including the Director of Public Health are hit by this enquiry. Therefore the question (a) and answer to that question (a) are both relevant.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ಕಳ್ಳಪ್ಪ.—ನಮ್ಮುಗು, ಈ ರಿಪೋರ್ಟ್ ನಡುವಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಯಾವಾಗ ತಲುಪಿತು?

Sri R. M. PATIL.—In the month of May 1957.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ತಂಪ್ಪ.—ಈ ರಿಪೋರ್ಟು ಬಂದ ಹೇಗೆ, ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ನಂಬಿಂಧವಟ್ಟ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳನ್ನೇ ಕೈಗೊಂಡ ಕ್ರಮ ಏನು?

Sri R. M. PATIL.—An enquiry is set up so far as disciplinary action is concerned.

Sri H. V. KOUJALGI.—How many officers are involved in this enquiry?

Sri R. M. PATIL.—There are a number of officers. So far as this enquiry is concerned, whether these officers are liable or not, that is another matter. So far as the enquiry against the Director of Public Health is concerned, that is proceeded against.

Sri H. V. KOUJALGI.—Just now the Minister was pleased to tell us that some other officers are involved—whether they are guilty or not is a different question. May I know against how many officers the enquiry is going on?

Sri R. M. PATIL.—I said one. The Director of Public Health is the only one proceeded against.

Sri H. V. KOUJALGI.—In that case, is not the answer incorrect?

Sri R. M. PATIL.—It is not incorrect. It is the report reported by the Enquiry Officer. My Hon'ble friend may read it again.

ಶ್ರೀ ಟಿ. ತಾರೀಗಾಡ.—ಇನ್‌ಕಾರ್ಯಾಲಯ ನಡೆದ ದ್ವಾರಾ ಡೈರೆಕ್ಟರ್ ರ ಅಖಾತ್ ಹೆಚ್. ಅವರಿಗೆ ನರ್ವಫೆಸ್ ಎಕ್ಸ್‌ಪೆಂಡ್‌ನ ಕೊಡಲಾಗಿದೆಯೇ?

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಈ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಉದ್ದೇಶನುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—May I know when the enquiry against the Director of Public Health was instituted?

Sri R. M. PATIL.—Some time in the last month and it is still going on.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—May I know whether the Director of Public Health is yet in office or he is given leave?

Sri R. M. PATIL.—My friend knows he has been on leave.

Sri F. H. MOHSIN.—Who was the officer in charge who conducted the enquiry?

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Enquiry Officer.

Sri F. H. MOHSIN.—What is his name, Sir?

Mr. SPEAKER.—The name need not be mentioned.

Sri F. H. MOHSIN.—During the enquiry was the Director of Public Health under suspension?

Sri R. M. PATIL.—That cannot be done unless there is a *prima facie* case against him. Hon'ble Member is a lawyer and he knows.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—Will the Government be pleased to state the opinion of the Director of Anti-Corruption on the report of the Enquiry Officer?

Mr. SPEAKER.—How can opinion be asked? The Hon'ble Member may ask for the fact.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—What is the recommendation of the Director of Anti-Corruption on the report of the Enquiry Officer?

Sri R. M. PATIL.—As regards recommendation . . .

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Enquiry Officer has reported that there was misuse of drugs to the extent of Rs. 14,000 and etc.

Sri R. M. PATIL.—Suitable action may be taken—that is the sum and substance of the recommendation. As regards the details, the concerned paper is not with me. I am therefore not in a position to give an answer.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—My question is: has or has not a recommendation been made by the Director of Anti-Corruption to Government? And if so, what is that recommendation?

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಕೇಳಿದರು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಎಂ. ಚನ್ನಬಸಪ್ಪ.—ಏನು ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ತಿಫಾರಸು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ? ಅದ್ದುಕ್ಕರು.—ಕ್ರಮ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ತಿಫಾರಸು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಎಂದು ಅಗಲೇ ಉತ್ತರ ಹೇಳಿದರು. *

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಎಂ. ಚನ್ನಬಸಪ್ಪ.—ಏನು ಕ್ರಮ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ತಿಫಾರಸು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ?

Sri R. M. PATIL.—As regards the details, the paper is not with me. If the paper had been with me I would have answered the question.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಎಂ. ಚನ್ನಬಸಪ್ಪ.—ಈ ರೀತಿ ತಿಫಾರಸು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ ನಿರ್ದಿಷ್ಟವಾಗಿ ಏನು ಕ್ರಮ ತೆಗೆದುಹಾಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ?

Sri R. M. PATIL.—I have already answered. We took the explanation from the Director of Public Health. Again that matter was referred to the Government; that means the Council of Ministers. The departmental enquiry is to be taken against him, according to the opinion of the Law Department.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Was this officer asked to take leave pending enquiry or was he asked to take leave after the enquiry was called upon? And was the Director asked to take leave in writing or orally?

Sri R. M. PATIL.—Please repeat the question.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Was this officer asked to take leave? If so was he asked to take leave in writing or was he orally asked to take leave?

Sri R. M. PATIL.—It is a matter of detail before the Enquiry Officer. So far as the Government is concerned, the Government is not aware of the details.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Was it at his own instance that leave was granted or did the Government ask him to take leave?

Sri R. M. PATIL.—He asked for leave and leave was granted.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Did Government ask him to take leave or did they not?

Sri R. M. PATIL.—So far as the departmental enquiry is concerned, my Hon'ble friend knows about the details as to how officers are treated. He was asked to take leave, failing which he would have been suspended.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—My question was whether Government asked him to take leave and if so whether it was in writing or orally?

(*Interruption*)

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Did Government ask him to take leave or leave was taken on his own accord?

Sri R. M. PATIL.—Because his presence was a little embarrassing so far as the enquiry was concerned he was asked to take leave. Every officer knows how departmental enquiries are conducted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I will hold over the question. It will be taken up tomorrow. Question time is over.

QUESTIONS FOR ANSWERS ON THE DAY

(but not taken up).

Loan advanced to Shankara Textile Mills, Davanagere.

Q.—3487. **Sri Y. VEERAPPA** (Hole-narasipur).—

Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(a) The total amount of loan advanced to the Shankara Textile Mills, Davangere, by the Government and the percentage of interest and terms under which the loan is advanced;

(b) the total interests so far derived;

(c) the mode of payment of the loan agreed upon;

(d) the period up to which the accounts of the Mills have been audited and the percentage of dividend declared?

A.—Sri C. M. POONACHA (Minister for Home Affairs and Industries).—

(a) (i) Rs 10 lakhs.

	Interest	Ordinary	Penal
Upto 1950	4 per cent		
From 15-6-50 to 16-1-56	4 per cent	5 per cent	
From 16-1-56 onwards	5 per cent	9 per cent	

(iii) *Terms.*—The entire loan of Rs. 10 lakhs was sanctioned for a period of one year. As the amount was not paid within that period, it was made repayable in monthly instalments of Rs. 15,000 each upto 14th April 1952. The remaining balance after 14th April 1952 was made repayable in monthly instalments of Rs. 6,000 each which subsequently was changed to 12 equal quarterly instalments.

(b)	Ordinary	2,13,918-8-3
	Penal	41,448-3-3

Total ...	2,55,366-11-6
-----------	---------------

(c) *Vide (a) (iii) above.*

(d) Audited upto 31st March 1957; percentage of dividend declared is 5 per cent.